



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/583,612

06/20/2006

Mark Alan Schultz

PU030327

5962

24498

7590

07/10/2008

Joseph J. Laks

Thomson Licensing LLC

2 Independence Way, Patent Operations

PO Box 5312

PRINCETON, NJ 08543

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ROCHELLE ANN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2862

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/10/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/583,612	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHULTZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ROCHELLE-ANN BLACKMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2862	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safran et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058416) in view of Keelan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,166).

Regarding claim 1, Safran discloses a projection system (see FIGS. 1-3), comprising: a plurality of displays (see 30 of FIGS. 1-3 and paragraph [0029]) arranged adjacent to each other to form a screen; a plurality of projectors (see 20 of FIGS. 1-3), one corresponding to each display of the plurality of displays, wherein each projector includes a lens (although not shown, "projectors" 20 are considered to have lens in order to function).

Regarding claim 2, Safran discloses the projection system of claim 1 wherein the plurality of displays are arranged in an N x 1 array (the plurality of displays in 30 are arranged in a 3 x 1 array in FIGS. 1C, 2, and 3).

Regarding claims 1 and 5-7, Safran does not appear disclose "a mask assembly disposed between and surrounding each lens of the plurality of projectors and the

corresponding plurality of displays; wherein the mask assembly includes a mask frame and a mask; wherein the mask is moveable relative to the mask frame; and wherein the mask is disposed on the lens".

Keelan teaches providing a mask assembly (see 10 of FIGS. 1-3) disposed between and surrounding a lens (see 28 of FIG. 3) of a projector (see 32 of FIG. 3); wherein the mask assembly includes a mask frame (see 11 of FIGS. 1 and 2) and a mask (see 12 of FIG 1); wherein the mask is moveable relative to the mask frame (see col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 2); and wherein the mask is disposed on the lens (see 10 relative to 28 in FIG. 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to provide the "projection system" of the Safran reference with a "mask assembly" with above-mentioned features, as taught by Keelan for purpose of enhancing the luminance and/or the sharpness of an image (see col. 1, lines 64-65) projected by the projectors and reducing the space taken up by the arrangement of elements within the "projection system", thus providing a more compact "projection system".

2. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safran et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0058416) in view of Keelan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,166) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamanaka (U.S. Patent No. 6,637,887).

Safran and Keelan disclose the claimed invention except for wherein each of the plurality of projectors further includes "a mirror"; and wherein the mirror is "aligned at an angle of about 45 degrees with respect to a lamp of the projector".

Yamanaka teaches providing each of a plurality of projectors (see 1 of FIG. 1) that includes a mirror (for example, see 23 and 24 of FIG. 20); and wherein the mirror is aligned at an angle of about 45 degrees (see position of 23 and 24 in FIG. 20) in with respect to a lamp (see 11 of FIG. 20) of the projector.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to the plurality of projectors of the "projection system" of the combined Safran and Keelan reference with a mirror and the above-mentioned arrangement thereof, as taught by Yamanaka for the purpose of directing the light from lamp of each of the plurality of projectors towards the lens of each of the plurality of projectors.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicants' arguments filed March 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argues on pg. 4 of the **Remarks**:

*...since Safran et el, only describes a multi projector system in which output from a plurality of projectors is projected onto a plurality of corresponding screens and Keelan et el. is not applicable to a multi-projector system since this reference only teaches an external aperture on a lens of a slide projector in which the size of the external aperture on the lens controls center to edge sharpness uniformity of an individually projected image, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claim 1.*

Applicants' further argue on pg. 7 of the **Remarks**:

*...since Safran et al. only describes a multi projector system in which output from a plurality of projectors is projected onto a plurality of corresponding screens, Keelan et al. is*

not applicable to a multi-projector system since this reference only teaches an external aperture on a lens of a slide projector in which the size of the external aperture on the lens controls center to edge sharpness uniformity of an individually projected image and Yamanaka only teaches only teaches sheet interceptors positioned to intercept only portions of the light paths output from a plurality of projectors onto a single screen, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicant's arrangement recited in claim 3.

In response to applicants' arguments that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation for the rejection is found in the references and in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Further, in response to applicants' arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Accordingly, Safran, Keelan, and Yamanaka still disclose the "claimed" invention.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROCHELLE-ANN BLACKMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-2113. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Assouad can be reached on (571) 272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:  
10/583,612  
Art Unit: 2862

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rochelle Blackman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2862

RB